

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY**

STATE OF DELAWARE)	
)	
v.)	ID#: 9408012457
)	
JOHN A. TAYLOR,)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

**Upon Defendant's Sixth Motion for Postconviction Relief –
*SUMMARILY DISMISSED***

1. On October 29, 2014, the court received the Supreme Court's mandate affirming the August 18, 2014 dismissal of Defendant's fifth motion for postconviction relief.

2. On August 25, 2015, Defendant filed his sixth motion for postconviction relief. The motion was properly referred.¹

3. Upon preliminary review,² it appears that just as Defendant's third, fourth, and fifth motions for postconviction relief were repetitive, so is this one. Defendant's sixth motion for postconviction relief is another, serial filing.

¹ Super. Ct. Crim. R. 61(d)(1).

² *Id.* 61(d)(2).

4. As to Defendant's third motion, the court found that Defendant's "underlying premise seems to be that if his claims are repeatedly reviewed, eventually they will achieve a better result." The court also found that was what Defendant's fourth and fifth motion for postconviction were. Now, the same can be said about this sixth motion for postconviction relief.

5. The court continues to find that the interest of justice does not dictate substantive review of this repetitive motion.

6. Notwithstanding the above, the court continues to question why the Attorney General will not agree, after twenty-one years, to cut Defendant's prison sentence and allow him to be deported. Even taking the seriousness of Defendant's crimes into account, the Attorney General's position has become callous. Moreover, the Attorney General's position is wasteful and pointless. Very little is being accomplished by continuing to make Delaware's taxpayers house and keep Defendant, instead of releasing him to Federal authorities for deportation to his home country.

For the foregoing reasons, the court will not call Defendant's sixth motion for postconviction relief frivolous, but Defendant's sixth motion for postconviction relief is **SUMMARILY DISMISSED**. The Prothonotary **SHALL** cause Defendant to be notified.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: October 9, 2015 /s/ Fred S. Silverman
Judge

cc: Prothonotary (Criminal)
Matthew P. Denn, Attorney General
Kathleen M. Jennings, State Prosecutor
Martin B. O'Connor, Deputy Attorney General
John A. Taylor, *pro se* Defendant